And if folks have suggestions, Mr. Speaker, if you would encourage folks, if it's about the FairTax, if they know how we can get this country back on track, they can send an email to fairtax@mail.house.gov and you will be able to see it. If it's about energy independence and how we can change national security in this country, how we can reclaim all of the bounty with which God has bestowed this country, energyindependence@mail.house.gov, Mr. Speaker, is an email address that folks can send their ideas to about how we can get this going forward, because I am certain as I am that the sky is blue that the best ideas for saving America in this time of crisis, Mr. Speaker, they are more likely to come from the family dinner table back home than the committee hearing room here.

That's who we are here. We're just folks who used to be at the family dinner table back home, and we've taken 2 years out of our lives to come up here and be a part of a larger discussion, but the good ideas still come from back home. Mr. Speaker, if folks would send in those ideas, we can begin to change this Chamber one seat at a time. We can begin to effect this process one Member of Congress at a time. Members of Congress don't change their minds or change their votes because of lobbyists on Capitol Hill. No, they change their minds and change their votes because of lobbyists back home, and that lobbyist is named Sally the pharmacist, and that lobbyist is named Steve who works at the foundry. Those lobbyists are the individual voters back home. That's what effects change in this place. That's what causes change to happen in Washington, DC.

The American people still run this Republic. I see it every day, and Mr. Speaker, if the American people would reclaim this House, reclaim this House by reclaiming their Representatives, by pushing forward those commonsense ideas—we don't need an economist to tell us, we know it to be true—we can reclaim this country.

□ 1410

I'm not telling you it can happen overnight. I'm not telling you it's going to be easy. But if there is one thing I am certain about America, Mr. Speaker, is in times of crisis we get the job done. If there's one thing I know about the American family, it's if you tell the American family they can't, then they will. We can do it, Mr. Speaker. 300 million Americans together can do this, but their ideas have to be heard.

This big freshman class, I would argue, is doing a better job of making the families' hopes and dreams heard on Capitol Hill than we've seen in my lifetime. But we can still do better. Fairtax@mail.house.gov and energyindependence@mail.house.gov. We will get those ideas heard.

Mr. Speaker, I'm grateful to you for providing me the time this afternoon. I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2192. An act to exempt for an additional 4-year period, from the application of the means-test presumption of abuse under chapter 7, qualifying members of reserve components of the Armed Forces and members of the National Guard who, after September 11, 2001, are called to active duty or to perform a homeland defense activity for not less than 90 days.

ENERGY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOSAR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, on the 8th day of March, 1956, a scientist, geologist by the name of M. King Hubbert spoke to an audience in San Antonio, Texas. The audience was a bunch of oil people. He gave what I think is going to be recognized as the most important speech of the last century. It was really a very audacious speech. At that time, the United States was King of Oil. We produced more oil, we sold more oil, and we consumed more oil than any nation in the world.

M. King Hubbert told that group of oil geologists and company executives that in just 14 short years the United States would reach its maximum oil production, that no matter what they did after that their oil production would decline. This was an incredible speech. Essentially no one believed it because, as I say, at that time the United States was the King of Oil, producing more, shipping more, consuming more than any other nation in the world.

For a number of years, M. King Hubbert was a pariah. Nobody believed him. He was kind of relegated to the lunatic fringe. In 1980, 10 years after his prediction that the United States would reach its maximum oil production, you could look back, and what you saw is shown on this chart. This, of course, goes out beyond that year. What you see is what happened then.

The United States did reach its maximum oil production in 1970. After that, the production fell off no matter what we did. Now, there was a little blip on the downside because we found a lot of oil in Alaska. You can see it there on the chart. And we found a lot of oil in the Gulf of Mexico, the yellow that you see there. There was a little blip on the down slope, and M. King Hubbert had not included in his predictions the oil that we would find in Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico. He included only the lower 48.

This chart shows where that oil came from. A lot of it came from Texas, the biggest single source of oil. The first oil, of course, was found in Pennsylvania and part of the rest of the USA. Then you have natural gas liquids on the top. As we found and used more and more natural gas, the natural gas liquids increased. That's not gas in your gas tank. That's propane and butane and things like that.

This is something that could have hardly been believed. How could a country as creative and innovative as the United States possibly not be able to continue to produce more and more oil when they needed more and more oil?

What M. King Hubbert did was a pretty simple thing. Oil had been pumped for long enough—50 years or so—by that time that they had some idea of what went on in a field, and the production in an individual oil field followed kind of a bell-shaped curve. As you pumped the field, you got more and more; and then when you reached the top, it became harder and harder to get the oil, and so it fell off as you went down the other side of the bell curve.

And so what he reasoned was, if I can make some estimate of how many oil fields there will be in the United States and I add up all those little oil fields, all those little bell curves, I'll get a big bell curve, and that will tell me when we're going to reach our maximum production in the United States.

Just about a year later, another speech was given. I don't know if these two gentlemen knew each other at all. But this other speech was given by the father of our nuclear submarine, Hyman Rickover. Hyman Rickover spoke to a group of physicians. The audience is irrelevant. He spoke to a group of physicians in St. Paul, Minnesota, and he said something that should have been self-evident, but obviously they weren't because nobody else was saying them and nobody has said them much since then.

What he said in this speech was that in the 8,000-year recorded history of man, the age of oil would be but a blip, and he referred to it as this ''golden age.'' Here are a few quotes from that speech.

By the way, you can find it on the Internet. If you simply Google for Rickover and energy speech, it will come up. It was lost for a number of years, and a few years ago it was found and put on the Internet. And what he says here seems to be axiomatic.

''There is nothing man can do to rebuild exhausted fossil fuel reserves. They were created by solar energy,'' he says, ''500 million years ago and took eons to grow to their present volume.

''In the face of the basic fact that fossil fuels are finite''—they will run out—''the exact length of time these reserves will last is important in only one respect: the longer they last, the more time do we have to invent ways of living off renewable or substitute energy sources and to adjust our economy to the vast changes which we can expect from such a shift.''

Now, this would seem to be, as I said, axiomatic. Obviously, the Moon isn't